

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/540,988	01/20/2006	Frank Hofmann	HOFMANN-5	9572	
	7590 11/30/200 IEREISEN, LLC	9	EXAM	IINER	
HENRY M FEIEREISEN			SINGH, SUNIL		
708 THIRD A' SUITE 1501	VENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK,	NY 10017		3672		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/30/2009	EL ECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

INFO@FEIEREISENLLC.COM

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/540,988 HOFMANN, FRANK Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit

	Sunil Singh	3672				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ldress			
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILLING DA Extension of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CPR 1-31 after 53K (5) MORTHS from the valling idea of the communication of	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till Il apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed in the mailing date of this c ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 Jun	<u>ly 2009</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
 Since this application is in condition for allowan 	ce except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the	e merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex	k parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1.3-11.16 and 21 is/are pending in the	application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
 Claim(s) <u>1,3-11,16 and 21</u> is/are rejected. 						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	pted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	rawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 Cl	FR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P7	ΓO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
 Certified copies of the priority documents 	have been received.					
Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Applicat	ion No				
Copies of the certified copies of the priori	-	ed in this National	Stage			
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate				

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 6) Other: _____. Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/540,988

Art Unit: 3672

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1,3-11,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahn et al. '256 in view of Lee '902 and EP document '756.

Hahn et al. discloses first and second sewer pipes (2), each including partial pipe shells (see Figs. 1-5, 7-8, 12-17), first connecting means connecting the partial pipe shells firmly to one another (see col. 3 lines 5-10, 55-65, col. 7 lines 55-65, see Figs. 1-5, 7-8, 12-17). Latch/recess (see Figs. 1-5, 7-8, 12-17, in particular Fig. 14). Seal between partial pipe shells (see col. 3 lines 5-10, 55-65, col. 7 lines 55-65). Plastic (see col. 7 lines 55-65). Hahn et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Hahn et al. is silent about including connecting means for transmitting a tensile force when the sewer pipes are attached longitudinally to one another and drawn horizontally into the ground by a device and a seal arranged between the first and second sewer pipes. Further, Hahn et al. is silent about the pipe shells being connected via a hinge. Lee teaches connecting means (see Figs. 1,2) for transmitting a tensile force when the sewer pipes are attached longitudinally to one another and a seal (51) arranged between the first and second sewer pipes. EP document '756 teaches a pipe comprising partial pipe shells being connected via a hinge (see Fig. 1). It would have

Art Unit: 3672

been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hahn et al. to include the "second" connecting means and seal as taught by Lee in order to reduce leakage between the first and second pipes. Further, it would have been considered obvious to modify Hahn et al. to include the hinge on his pipe sections as taught by EP document '756 in order to keep the pipe sections from separating and getting misplaced.

With regards to claim 11, it would have been considered obvious to modify Hahn et al. by reinforcing the plastic pipe via glass fibers in order to provide a pipe that would not buckle easily.

3. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP document '583 in view of Lee and Hahn et al and EP document '756
EP document '583 discloses a method for laying a sewer pipe (22,24) comprising the steps of connecting an end of a first sewer (24) to a boring device (21,22,20) and/or second sewer pipe and drawing the sewer pipe into the ground by means of the boring device (see Figs. 5, 6,7,10,11). EP document '583 discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, EP document '583 lacks a connection means between the first sewer and the boring device and/or the second sewer pipe that enable a transmission of tensile forces and a seal between first and second sewer pipes. Further, EP document lack sewer pipe assembled from partial pipe shells. Further, EP document '583 is silent about the pipe being formed as partial pipe shells which are connected together via a hinge. Lee teaches connecting means (see Figs. 1,2) between sewer pipes and/or a

Application/Control Number: 10/540,988

Art Unit: 3672

device for transmitting a tensile force when connected and a seal (51) arranged between the first and second sewer pipes. Hahn et al. teaches partial pipe shells (see Figs. 1-5, 7-8, 12-17). EP document '756 teaches a pipe comprising partial pipe shells being connected via a hinge (see Fig. 1) It would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify EP document to include the connecting means and seal as taught by Lee in order to reduce leakage between the connected sections. Further, it would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify EP document to assemble the sewer pipe via partial pipe shells as taught by Hahn et al. in order to have to avoid interrupting the supply lines. Further, it would have been considered obvious to modify EP document '583 to include the hinge on the pipe sections as taught by EP document '756 in order to keep the pipe sections from separating and getting misplaced.

Response to Arguments

 Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sunil Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7051.
 The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 10:30 AM - 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bagnell can be reached on (571) 272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/540,988

Art Unit: 3672

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sunil Singh/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3672 Sunil Singh Primary Examiner Art Unit 3672

SS

11/21/09